

**Port Botany Expansion
Community Consultative Committee
Minutes**

Date: 27th April, 2010

Meeting number: 30

Attendees:

Roberta Ryan (RR) - Chairperson
 Nancy Hillier (NH) - Community Representative
 Neil Melvin (NM) - Community Representative
 Steven Poulton (SP) - City of Botany Bay Council
 Warwick O'Brien (WO) - City of Botany Bay Council
 Daniel Banovic – (DB) Baulderstone
 Quentin Pitts – (QP) Baulderstone
 Vanessa Tierman – (VT) Baulderstone
 Shane Hobday – (SH) Sydney Ports Corporation
 Paul Jerogin – (PJ) Sydney Ports Corporation
 Frank van den Brink - (FB) Sydney Ports Corporation
 Sandra Spate - Minutetaker

Apologies: Marika Calfas - Sydney Ports Corporation; Kathy Lloyd - Sydney Ports Corporation; Paul Pickering - Community Representative; Michael Kavanagh - Business Representative

Not present: Mick Costelloe - Community Representative; John Burgess - Community Representative; Bronwyn Englaro - Randwick City Council

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	Welcome and apologies			
1.1	The chair welcomed CCC members and noted that this is a special meeting focusing on the Grade Separation Works. The meeting suspended the regular agenda to consider the Grade Separation Works.			
2	Grade Separation Works Presentation			
2.1	<u>Introduction and background</u> SH reported that the Grade Separation Works were approved as part of the Port Botany Expansion EIS. The issue of the need to separate the rail and road at Penrhyn Road has been ongoing for many years. The work will separate road from rail and will assist to take truck queuing off Foreshore Road. The intention is for the Plans to be submitted the NSW Department of Planning by the end of May and for works to be complete by the end of 2011. Access to Port facilities will be maintained throughout construction. CCC members were encouraged to provide comments on the Management Plans. <u>Presentation</u> A visual presentation of the proposed Grade Separation Works was			

	<p>presented to the meeting. FB reported that since February there have been ongoing investigations and discussions with RTA and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The intention is to separate the road network from the existing and future rail network.</p> <p>The T3 rail corridor will be beside the existing rail line.</p> <p>The new structure will be 7.5m to 8m above the existing intersection.</p> <p>Currently work is being undertaken for the enabling road access to Cargo Link (part of the Patricks Container Terminal), with kerb and guttering commencing on the detour road as well as the relocation of the Patricks gate.</p> <p>Next will be the Patrick's temporary detour road. The permanent gate will be approximate 390m west of the existing. Three lanes will be for Patricks traffic and two lanes separated from this will be for construction traffic.</p> <p>This would be followed by temporary road works either side of Penrhyn Rd to allow the construction of the ramp. Once the detour road is completed, a temporary roundabout will be located outside the Caltex gate shutting down the existing intersection. Piling to depths of 16m to 23 m will be required, but all major services are currently located throughout the roundabout. Existing services need to be relocated before work commences. This process requires the Management Plan to be approved before work can commence on service relocation.</p> <p>Access to Patricks and the Customs/Quarantine facilities will need to be maintained at all times.</p> <p>Some bridge sections will be prefabricated.</p> <p>Staging of the elevated roundabout will occur to ensure continuity of access to port facilities. There will be a revised Caltex entry point. The Foreshore Road interface will be the last works in the schedule.</p> <p>There was also a visual presentation of traffic modeling based on am and pm peak period truck movements, which indicated that only 4% of truck movements along Foreshore Road entered the Port. This has been presented to the RTA and attached to the Traffic Management Plan. The design of the interface with Foreshore Road is yet to be resolved.</p>			
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
<p>2.2</p>	<p>PJ asked what needed to be shut down before piling started.</p> <p>FB replied that the existing entry to Patricks and Cargo link would be shut down. An application has gone to Telstra last week and one will go to Sydney Water this week. There are discussions underway to link Patricks with a new high voltage supply, as the existing is under the construction area and works cannot proceed over existing cables.</p> <p>SP asked whether designs for service relocation need approval from relevant agencies.</p> <p>FB replied they did and it was underway.</p>			
<p>2.3</p>	<p>NH asked whether meetings had been held with Orica.</p> <p>FB replied there hadn't as Orica was located outside the area in question.</p>			

2.4	<p>The chair asked FB to summarise for the meeting the main benefits of the Grade Separation works.</p> <p>FB replied the biggest benefit was to eliminate current and future bottlenecks with the need for the T3 railway corridor and the Patricks track duplication.</p> <p>SH noted Patricks' current short queuing area for trucks. The separation works would avoid trucks queuing onto Foreshore Road due to shunting operations.</p> <p>RR summarized discussion on the ultimate benefit as to avoid trucks queuing on to Foreshore Road and that trains and trucks would be independent of each other within the Port.</p>			
2.5	<p>NH asked whether there would be impacts further down towards the level crossing closer to Mascot.</p> <p>FB replied that this isn't known, but there are large scale rail duplication works in conjunction with the intermodal terminal</p> <p>SH responded that talks are being held with ARTC as part of the works.</p> <p>FB noted there are issues under discussion which need to be resolved as the scope of ARTC works finishes in the middle of the roundabout.</p> <p>NH asked whether the Banksia St overpass was also being considered.</p> <p>SH noted that FB is also involved with the Banksia St overpass.</p>			
2.6	<p>NH asked whether the works would stop trucks queuing.</p> <p>FB replied the final configuration would, as would the temporary scenario of 300m of 3 lanes.</p>			
2.7	<p>SP noted that construction on Hale St would coincide with this construction. He thought the impact of Hale St would be minimal, but positive.</p> <p>PJ asked whether it was expected Hale St would be finished before construction on Grade Separation starts.</p> <p>FB replied it would.</p>			
2.8	<p>NM asked whether the new terminal operator's trucks would be confined to the new bridge.</p> <p>FB replied they would for day to day operations. Only in emergencies would they have access via the Penrhyn Road.</p>			
2.9	<p>NM asked when the new operator was expected to start.</p> <p>SH replied the hand over was expected mid next year and then their own construction would commence. There was a need to construct a lot of infrastructure. Operations were expected to commence in 2012.</p> <p>FB noted that Grade Separation works would be complete before the new operator started container handling operations.</p>			
2.1.0	<p>NM expressed surprised that only 4% of trucks from Foreshore Road enter the Port. He applauded the 3 lanes into Patricks.</p>			
2.1.1	<p>NM noted mention of the opportunity for two lanes to turn left onto Foreshore Road, and indicated that this was already the case.</p> <p>FB replied there are actually three lanes, but issues around merging of traffic with the left hand turn into Foreshore Road need to be resolved with the RTA. Five options for this are currently under consideration.</p>			

	FB also noted the option to send trucks to Simblist Road in case of excessive queuing.			
2.1.2	PJ asked whether the timeframe for the Grade Separation Works would be about 18 months. DB replied it was due for completion in 2011. FB noted the completion of the Grade Separation is not necessarily linked to completion of the T3 rail corridor.			
3	Grade Separation Construction Environmental Management			
3.1	QP reported that CCC members have been provided with the Grade Separation Construction Environmental Management Plans including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environment Management Plan • Acid Sulphate Soils Management Sub Plan • Dust and Air Quality Management Sup Plan • Soil and Water Management Sub Plan • Waste and Spoil Management Sub Plan • Construction Noise and Vibration Management Sup Plan • Emergency Response Incident Management Plan • Traffic Management Plan Department of Planning and DECCW have received copies of these. NH has provided written feedback on the plans. Feedback from the CCC was sought as quickly as possible. Feedback on the Traffic Management Plan and the Emergency Response Plan was requested by May 5. The Plans for the Grade Separation are similar in nature to plans provided for the port expansion.			
	Questions and discussion			
3.2	NH asked who was responsible for the Hazard Analysis in the Emergency Response Plan. QP reported that it is John Wither, Boulderstone's Safety Manager. He indicated that contamination problems were not expected as data indicates work will be outside the exclusion zone. However plans will be in place to manage it should it arise. NH indicated that she was comforted by the fact that it was difficult to find omissions in the Hazard Risk Analysis.			
3.3	NM asked how confusion would be avoided with the road changes. How would it be ensured that truck drivers were aware of stages? DB responded that Variable Message Signs would be in place two days prior to construction. Issues could then be looked at and changes made if required. FB noted there would be a week settling period for major changes before closing off old routes.			
3.4	SP asked whether the location of site offices would be changed. DB noted there would be a relocation of the office complex. FB reported that during the Patricks detour there would still be entry to the existing offices, but exit arrangements would be changed. This would be part of the Traffic Management Plan.			

3.5	<p>QP noted that members could use various opportunities for feedback including the printed forms provided, written submissions, email or phone calls.</p> <p>NM noted difficulties with providing feedback, and suggested that as only two of the six community members were present, arrangements should be made for them to see the presentation, as he felt it was important for their understanding. He noted the short timeline for feedback and the fact that members would be disadvantaged by not seeing the presentation. He asked that an update be provided at the next meeting even if this is past the date for comment.</p> <p>SH indicated he would follow up with CCC members who are not at the meeting.</p> <p>QP indicated he was happy to meet with these members.</p>	<p>SH to contact CCC members who were not present to explore possibilities of receiving their input into Plans.</p> <p>SPC to provide an update to the next CCC meeting on Grade Separation Works.</p>	<p>SPC</p> <p>SPC</p>	
3.6	<p>NM noted he thought there wouldn't be major environmental concerns as the proposed works did not include the Penrhyn Estuary.</p> <p>PJ noted that with the current project, the expansion, an Environmental Protection Licence is required but as no dredging works are associated with the Grade Separation Works no licence is required.</p>			
3.7	<p>The CCC meeting thanked Frank van den Brink for his presentation to the meeting.</p>			
3.8	<p>SH thanked NH and NM on behalf of SPC for their attendance and input.</p>			
4	Other Matters/Next meeting – Tuesday 8 June 2010			
4.1	<p>The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 8 June, 2010.</p>			

<p>These minutes have been endorsed by the Chair, Roberta Ryan.</p>
